UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/966,814	09/28/2001	Bruce Alexander	VIGL118030	3066

26389 7590 04/04/2007

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER	
PESIN, BORIS M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2174	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/966,814	ALEXANDER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Boris Pesin	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *1/03/2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 1/13/2007.

Claims 1-40 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 25, 29, and 37 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 1/13/2007, Claims 1, 25, 29, and 37 were amended. This action is made Non-Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-16, 19, 23-27, and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Edlund et al. (US 6085227).

As per independent claim 1, Crater teaches a method for interacting with a remote device comprising: obtaining a request corresponding to controlling at least one identifiable remote devices (column 3, lines 58-64); generating a graphical user

interface responsive to said request, the graphical user interface being operable to control the remote device, wherein controlling said device includes accessing said remote device and issuing instructions (column 3, lines 37-45 and lines 58-64); transmitting remote device control data corresponding to said user control instructions (column 7, lines 25-36); and obtaining remote device data generated by said remote device (column 7, lines 25-36).

Crater does not teach obtaining user control instructions from said graphical user interface for controlling the remote device, wherein the remote device is controlled by one authorized user at a time. Edlund teaches, obtaining user control instructions from said graphical user interface for controlling the remote device, wherein the remote device is controlled by one authorized user at a time (i.e. "the nature of the remote device 106 may limit the number of users that are able to control the remote device 106 at any point in time (typically only one user at a time can issue commands to the remote device 106), although any number of users may be able to observe the results and status information from the device 106." (Column 4, Lines 58-63)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Crater with the teachings of Edlund and include a method to restrict access to the number of users who can access a remote device at one time with the motivation to provide the user a simpler method of accessing a device without other users interfering with the access.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches that generating a graphical user interface includes dynamically generating a graphical user interface (column 8, lines 20-25).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Crater teaches dynamically generating a graphical user interface includes: identifying a remote device corresponding to said request (column 8, lines 19-36); selecting a program module corresponding to said identified remote device from a plurality of program modules, said program module operable to control said remote device (column 8, lines 19-36); generating a screen interface including said selected program module, said program module including a graphical user interface component corresponding to said requested remote device (column 8, lines 25-36).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 2, Crater teaches dynamically generating a graphical user interface includes: identifying two or more remote devices corresponding to said request (column 9, lines 54-62, i.e. – data from many remote devices can be displayed together); selecting a program module corresponding to each identified remote device from a plurality of program modules, said program modules operable to control said remote device (column 9, lines 54-62); generating a single screen interface containing all program modules, said program modules operable to generate graphical user interface components corresponding to each requested remote device (column 9, lines 23-26 and lines 54-62).

Claim 30 is similar in scope to claim 4, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Crater teaches that control instructions control the operation of all of said remote devices (column 2, lines 63-68).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 2, Crater teaches that the graphical user interface is a Web page (column 8, lines 19-25).

Claim 31 is similar in scope to claim 6, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 2, Crater teaches obtaining a request corresponding to controlling one or more identifiable remote devices includes: obtaining a request for monitoring data corresponding to said remote device (column 8, lines 19-25).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 2, Crater teaches wherein obtaining a request corresponding to controlling one or more identifiable remote devices includes: obtaining a request to transmit data to said remote device (column 7, lines 25-36).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Crater teaches that the transmitted data causes said remote device to move (column 7, lines 25-36).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches transmitting control data includes: transmitting a request for accessing data from said remote device (column 10, lines 49-59); and transmitting authorization for access to said remote device (column 10, lines 49-59).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches obtaining remote device data generated by said remote device includes: obtaining real-time data generated by said remote device (column 3, lines 12-15).

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches obtaining remote device data generated by said remote device includes: obtaining pre-recorded data generated by said remote device (column 3, lines 15-23).

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches that the remote device is a video camera, and wherein obtaining remote device data includes obtaining video data from said video camera (column 3, lines 12-23).

As per claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, Crater teaches that transmitting control data includes transmitting data manipulating said video camera (column 7, lines 25-31).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches that transmitting data includes manipulating operating parameters of said remote device using said graphical user interface (column 9, lines 4-12); and wherein obtaining remote device data includes obtaining remote device data generated by said remote device based on said manipulated operating parameters (column 9, lines 4-12).

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Crater teaches that the graphical user interface includes a graphical means for manipulating said operating parameters of said remote device, said graphical means operable to receive user inputs corresponding to said manipulation (column 3, lines 62-65 and column 7, lines 25-31).

As per claim 19, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches obtaining user control data includes obtaining a request for manipulating operating parameters of said remote device (column 3, lines 62-65); and wherein transmitting remote device control data includes translating said request into device specific commands, and transmitting

said device specific commands to said remote device operable to change said operating parameters of said remote device (column 7, lines 25-36).

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions (column 3, lines 24-35).

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches a system having a processor, a memory, and an operating environment (column 3, lines 24-35).

As per independent claim 25, Crater teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components for dynamically interacting between at least one remote device and a computing device, comprising: a user interface application operable to dynamically generate a graphical user interface corresponding to the remote device in response to a request for interaction with the remote device (column 8, lines 20-25); a device interface application operable to obtain device data from the remote device (column 7, lines 25-36), and operable to manipulate said data (column 7, lines 25-36); and a data transmittal application operable to transmit said data to the computing device, and to facilitate communication between the remote device and the computing device (column 7, lines 25-36).

Crater does not teach a graphical user interface is operable to obtain user instructions to control the remote device, and wherein the remote device may be controlled by one user at a time and wherein the data controls the functionality of the remote device from the computing device. Edlund teaches, a graphical user interface is operable to obtain user instructions to control the remote device, and wherein the remote device may be controlled by one user at a time and wherein the data controls

the functionality of the remote device from the computing device (i.e. "the nature of the remote device 106 may limit the number of users that are able to control the remote device 106 at any point in time (typically only one user at a time can issue commands to the remote device 106), although any number of users may be able to observe the results and status information from the device 106." (Column 4, Lines 58-63)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Crater with the teachings of Edlund and include a method to restrict access to the number of users who can access a remote device at one time and control the functionality of the remote device with the motivation to provide the user a simpler method of accessing a device without other users interfering with the access and provide the user greater flexibility in accessing devices that otherwise would not be accessible.

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 25, Crater teaches that the computing device is a server computer (column 9, lines 42-47).

As per claim 27, which is dependent on claim 25, Crater teaches that the computing device is a client computer (column 9, lines 62-66).

As per independent claim 37, Crater teaches a system for dynamically generating a user interface for controlling at least one remote device comprising: at least one remote device operable to receive control commands and to transmit monitoring data based on said control commands (column 7, lines 25-36); a server

computer in communication with said remote device, said server computer operable to dynamically generate a graphical user interface (column 9, lines 42-47); a client computer in communication with said server computer, said client computer operable to display said graphical user interface, and request said control commands for controlling said remote device(column 9, lines 62-67).

Crater does not teach controlling a remote device, wherein the remote device may be controlled by one user at a time. Edlund teaches, controlling the remote device, and wherein the remote device may be controlled by one user at a time (i.e. "the nature of the remote device 106 may limit the number of users that are able to control the remote device 106 at any point in time (typically only one user at a time can issue commands to the remote device 106), although any number of users may be able to observe the results and status information from the device 106." (Column 4, Lines 58-63)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Crater with the teachings of Edlund and include a method to restrict access to the number of users who can access a remote device at one time with the motivation to provide the user a simpler method of accessing a device without other users interfering with the access.

As per claim 38, which is dependent on claim 37, Crater teaches a proxy server in communication with said client computer and said server computer, said proxy server operable to process and store monitoring data generated by said remote device (column 9, lines 15-20 and column 7, lines 32-36, i.e. – camera output signals are

stored on a network host and transferred to a local server to be displayed on a client system).

As per claim 39, which is dependent on claim 37, Crater teaches that the server computer and said client computer are in communication via the Internet (column 7, lines 37-49).

As per claim 40, which is dependent on claim 37, Crater teaches that the server computer and said client computer are in communication via a dedicated device control network (column 7, lines 37-49).

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Edlund et al. (US 6085227) further in view of Amini et al. ("Amini," US006698021B1).

As per claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, the teachings of Crater- Edlund in regards to claim 16 have been discussed above. Crater teaches that the remote device is a video camera (column 3, lines 12-23). Crater does not disclose a graphical means that is a graphical controller including graphical representation of a compass having an origin and directional indicators.

Amini teaches a graphical means that is a graphical controller including graphical representation of a compass having an origin and directional indicators (figure 10C, element 1032 and column 16, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater- Edlund with a graphical means to control a video camera using a compass

representation, as taught by Amini, with the motivation to provide an intuitive user interface capable of controlling camera motion relative to any initial camera position (column 16, lines 1-6)

Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Edlund et al. (US 6085227) in view of Amini et al. ("Amini," US006698021B1) in further view of Brush, II et al. ("Brush," US# 5732232).

As per claim 18, which is dependent on claim 17, teachings of the combination of Crater- Edlund and Amini in regards to claim 16 have been discussed above. The combination of Crater- Edlund and Amini do not disclose that the graphical controller is operable to communicate the intensity of said manipulation, said intensity based on the distance away said user input is from said origin.

Brush teaches that the graphical controller is operable to communicate the intensity of said manipulation, said intensity based on the distance away said user input is from said origin (column 3, lines 28-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of the combination of Crater- Edlund and Amini with a means to indicate the intensity of user input based on the distance the user input is from the origin, as taught by Brush, with the motivation to more efficiently translate user input into desired outcomes on a graphical user interface and to enable a greater degree of user control of the interface (column 4, lines 65-67)

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 18, Crater teaches remote device data generated by said remote device based on said changed operating parameters is real-time data (column 3, lines 12-15).

Claims 21 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Edlund et al. (US 6085227) further in view of Lemons et al. ("Lemons," US006504479B1).

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 1, the teachings of Crater- Edlund in regards to claim 1 have been discussed above. Crater- Edlund does not disclose that the remote device is selected from the group consisting of intrusion detection devices, card readers, door strikes and contacts, access control panels, bar code scanners, video cameras, still cameras, and microphones.

Lemons teaches that the remote device is selected from the group consisting essentially of intrusion detection devices, card readers, door strikes and contacts, access control panels, bar code scanners, video cameras, still cameras, and microphones (column 6, lines 65-68 and column 6, lines 41-57 and column 5-6, lines 47-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater- Edlund to include intrusion detection devices, card readers, door strikes and contacts, access control panels, bar code scanners, video cameras, still cameras, and microphones, as taught by Lemons, with the motivation to monitor and control all aspects of an integrated security system (column 2, lines 30-33).

Claim 28 is similar in scope to claim 21, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Edlund et al. (US 6085227) further in view of Nail (US# 5758340).

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 1, the teachings of Crater- Edlund in regards to claim 1 have been discussed above. Crater- Edlund does not disclose that the remote device can be locked, thereby preventing the simultaneous submission of instructions by more than one user.

Nail teaches that the remote device can be locked, thereby preventing the simultaneous submission of instructions by more than one user (column 3, lines 6-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater- Edlund with a means to lock a remote device to prevent simultaneous submission of instructions by more than one user, as taught by Nail, with the motivation to prevent data inconsistency (column 3, line 6).

Claim 29-31 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being obvious over Crater et al ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Hesselink (US 6499054).

As per independent claim 29, Crater teaches a method for dynamically generating a graphical user interface for controlling at least one pre-selected remote device comprising: obtaining a request to control at least one pre-selected remote

device from the client device (column 3, lines 58-64); and selecting one or more program modules corresponding to said request to control at least one pre-selected remote device from a plurality of program modules in response to said request, said one or more program modules operable to control said remote device (column 7, lines 25-36); transmitting a screen interface with said one or more program modules (column 7, lines 25-36); wherein said screen interface containing said one or more program modules is operable to generate a graphical user interface for controlling at least one pre-selected remote device when loaded within a browser application on the client device (column 9, lines 62-66). Crater does not teach a computer system including a client device in communication with a central server via a communication server and obtaining a request to control at least one pre-selected remote device from a remote device by a central server. Hesselink teaches a computer system including a remote device in communication with a central server via a communication server and obtaining a request to control at least one pre-selected remote device from a remote device by a central server (i.e. Figure 1A, and Figure 1B). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Crater with the teachings of Hesselink and include a central server to control a pre-selected device with the motivation to provide the user with feedback and minimal delay (Hesselink, Column 1, Line 60).

As per claim 30, which is dependent on claim 29, Crater teaches a method wherein said request to control includes two or more pre-selected devices, and wherein said screen interface is an integrated screen interface containing said program modules (column 9, lines 54-62, i.e. – data from many remote devices can be displayed

together), said program modules operable to generate a graphical user interface corresponding to said requested remote device when said single screen interface is loaded on a browser application (column 9, lines 23-26 and lines 54-62).

As per claim 31, which is dependent on claim 29, Crater teaches that the graphical user interface is a Web page (column 8, lines 19-25).

As per claim 35, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions (column 3, lines 24-35).

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 1, Crater teaches a system having a processor, a memory, and an operating environment (column 3, lines 24-35).

Claims 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Hesselink (US 6499054) further in view of Lemons et al. ("Lemons," US006504479B1).

As per claim 32, which is dependent on claim 29, the teachings of Crater and Hesselink in regards to claim 29 have been discussed above. Crater and Hesselink do not explicitly disclose that the pre-selected remote device is a video camera having pan-tilt-zoom functionality, and wherein said graphical user interface is operable to control said pan-tilt-zoom functionality of said video camera and to view data from said video camera.

Lemons teaches that the pre-selected remote device is a video camera having pan-tilt-zoom functionality, and wherein said graphical user interface is operable to control said pan-tilt-zoom functionality of said video camera and to view data from said

video camera (column 5, lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater and Hesselink with a means to control the pan-tilt-zoom functionality of a video camera and view data from the video camera, as taught by Lemons, with the motivation to control the function of remote video camera (column 3, lines 9-11) and provide the user with easy to access information that would not normally be easily accessible.

As per claim 34, which is dependent on claim 29, the teachings of Crater and Hesselink in regards to claim 29 have been discussed above. Crater and Hesselink do not disclose that the pre-selected remote device is a motion detector.

Lemons teaches that the pre-selected remote device is a motion detector (column 7, lines 5-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater and Hesselink to include intrusion detection devices, card readers, door strikes and contacts, access control panels, bar code scanners, video cameras, still cameras, and microphones, as taught by Lemons, with the motivation to monitor and control all aspects of an integrated security system (column 2, lines 30-33).

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crater et al. ("Crater," US005982362A) in view of Hesselink (US 6499054) further in view of Launey et al. ("Launey," US005086385A).

As per claim 33, which is dependent on claim 29, the teachings of Crater and Hesselink in regards to claim 29 have been discussed above. Crater does not disclose

that the pre-selected remote device is a temperature control device, and wherein said graphical user interface is operable to control said change in temperature of said temperature control device. However, Crater disclose monitoring of temperature (column 8, lines 26-31).

Launey teaches that the pre-selected remote device is a temperature control device, and wherein said graphical user interface is operable to control said change in temperature of said temperature control device (column 16, lines 48-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Crater and Hesselink with a means to control the temperature through a user interface, as taught by Launey, with the motivation to provide a simple interface to control the environment of a building (column 3, lines 10-13).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16, 19, 23-27, and 37-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 1/03/2007 in regards to claims 29-36 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Crater-Hesselink does not teach, "obtaining a request to control at least one pre-selected remote device." The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Hesselink Figure 1A and Figure 1B clearly illustrate a request to control at least one pre-selected remote device (Element 70) by a central server (Element 74). Furthermore, Crater teaches "a request to control at least one pre-selected remote device." When the user accesses the system in Crater, he is in fact accessing at least one pre-selected remote device.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristine Kincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

BP